

Quantum spin tunneling of magnetization in small ferromagnetic particles

D. Galetti^a, B.M. Pimentel^a, C.L. Lima^{b,*}, and E.C. Silva^a

^aInstituto de Física Teórica

Universidade Estadual Paulista — UNESP

Rua Pamplona 145

01405 - 900 São Paulo, S.P.

Brazil

^bInstituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo

C.P. 66318, 05315-970, São Paulo, S.P.

Brazil

February 6, 2008

Abstract

A new quantum approach is presented that can account for the description of small ferromagnetic particles magnetization tunneling. An estimate of the saturation value of an external applied magnetic field along the easy axis is obtained. An analytic expression for the tunneling factor in the absence of an external magnetic field is deduced from the present approach that also allows to obtain the crossover temperature characterizing the regime where tunneling is dominated by the quantum effects.

Pacs: 75.75.+a, 73.40.Gk, 03.65.-w

Keywords: Spin tunneling, Small ferromagnetic particles

*Corresponding author. E-mail address: cllima@if.usp.br (C.L. Lima)

Single-domain magnetic particles constitute a scenario in which macroscopic quantum tunneling can be studied. In such systems of mesoscopic size the electronic spins can form an aligned magnetic state that can be oriented in several directions. Quantum mechanics can then be called upon to estimate the tunneling probability that may occur, associated with the possibility of a change of the magnetization from one direction to another. The existence of an energy barrier to be tunneled that do not completely disappear even with a decrease in the temperature towards absolute zero has therefore been suggested and several attempts have been presented in order to estimate the rate of tunneling in these cases [1, 2, 3, 4]. In some approaches an adapted version of the WKB is proposed, while, from another perspective, other approaches make use of Feynman's path integral with $su(2)$ coherent states from which the instanton method follows to treat this same quantum problem for a single spin in predicting the energy levels splitting .

In general, those approaches start with a Hamiltonian that is associated with a model of the physical system and some considerations are presented in order to get a pair of complementary operators which should characterize the degree of freedom. To this end, the spin system which is characterized by a finite-dimensional state space, is converted into a continuous one by means of a transformation which leads to a pair of canonical operators satisfying a new commutation relation which is now dependent on the particle spin quantum number [5]. It is to be observed that this construction is valid for large spin values and that corrections of quantum character must be introduced for small/medium values.

In the present paper we intend to show that a new quantum description recently proposed [6] can be used in such a way that the energy levels splitting in ferromagnetic particles can be obtained in a direct and simple way.

We start from a model Hamiltonian describing the ferromagnetic particle [3]

$$\mathcal{H} = -K_1 S_z^2 + K_2 S_y^2 + K_3 H_z S_z \quad (1)$$

written in terms of spin operators S_y and S_z with $K_1, K_2 > 0$, corresponding to the case of easy-axis anisotropy along the z axis and an external magnetic field pointing along the z direction. Putting this Hamiltonian in a form that emphasizes the creation and annihilation operators we get

$$\mathcal{H} = A S_z^2 + B (S_+^2 + S_-^2) + C S^2 + K_3 H_z S_z, \quad (2)$$

where $A = -(K_1 + K_2/2)$, $B = -K_2/4$, and $C = K_2/2$. From a formal point of view, it is interesting to see that this Hamiltonian is akin to that

one suggested to describe the Fe_8 magnetic cluster (also with an external magnetic field) and that has been treated elsewhere [6].

The starting point of the proposed approach is the introduction of a quantum phenomenological Hamiltonian describing the spin system, written in terms of angular momentum operators obeying the standard commutation relations, and that reflects the internal symmetries of the system. It may also contain terms taking into account external applied magnetic fields. The degree of freedom that undergoes tunneling is considered a particular collective manifestation of the system, and it is assumed to be the only relevant one. At the same time, the temperature of the system is assumed so conveniently low that possible related thermally assisted processes are not taken into account so that only quantum effects are considered.

The next step consists in getting a new Hamiltonian that is an approximate version of Eq. (2). This new Hamiltonian is obtained through a series of transformations performed on the matrix generated by calculating the expectation values of Eq. (2) with the $su(2)$ coherent states $|j, z\rangle$, where z is a complex variable and j characterizes the angular momentum state multiplet [7]. The Hamiltonian in the overcomplete spin coherent states representation is then given by

$$\langle j, z' | H | j, z \rangle = K(z', z), \quad (3)$$

the also known generator coordinate energy kernel [8]; it embodies all the quantum information related to the system we want to study. The procedure of extracting a new Hamiltonian – written now in terms of an angle variable – from Eq. (3) has been already shown elsewhere and will not be repeated here [6, 9, 10]. In fact, as it was proved there, the variational generator coordinate method can in this case be used to rewrite the Hamiltonian from which we start in an exact and discrete representation which can then be conveniently treated in order to give an approximate Hamiltonian in the angle representation. It is important to point that the Hamiltonian we obtain is in fact an approximate one, but we have also shown, by studying the Lipkin model [11], that it is already a reliable Hamiltonian for spin systems with $j \gtrsim 5$ [6]. Furthermore, since this approach is based on quantum grounds from the beginning, it does not need to go through any quantization process. Also, it is not necessary to convert the discrete spin system into a continuous one as it is usually done [5], at the same time that the quantum character of the angle-angular momentum pair is properly taken into account.

Now, carrying out all the steps of the approach, we obtain the approxi-

mate Hamiltonian in the angle representation, namely

$$H(\phi) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\phi} \frac{1}{M(\phi)} \frac{d}{d\phi} + V(\phi) \quad (4)$$

where

$$M(\phi) = \frac{1}{2(K_2 + K_1 \cos^2 \phi) - \frac{K_3}{j} H_z \cos \phi} \quad (5)$$

is the effective mass,

$$V(\phi) = -K_1 j(j+1) \cos^2 \phi + K_3 H_z \sqrt{j(j+1)} \cos \phi \quad (6)$$

is the potential respectively, and j is the total spin of the ferromagnetic particle. By a direct inspection we see that the potential function has minima at $\phi = 0, \pi$, while the maxima occur at

$$\cos \phi = \frac{K_3 H_z}{2K_1 \sqrt{j(j+1)}},$$

respectively. It is immediate to see that for $H_z = 0$, the maxima are at $\phi = \pi/2$ and $3\pi/2$.

As has been mentioned before, the accuracy of this approximation can be checked by comparing the eigenvalues of the Schrödinger equation

$$H(\phi) \Psi_k(\phi) = \mathcal{E}_k \Psi_k(\phi) \quad (7)$$

with those obtained by diagonalizing Hamiltonian (1) in the $\{|jm\rangle\}$ state space. By its turn, it is immediate to see that the numerical results of Eq. (7) can be directly obtained from a Fourier analysis that give the energy eigenstates and the corresponding eigenfunctions. It has also been shown elsewhere [6] that already for $j \gtrsim 5$ solutions of Hamiltonians of this kind are in good agreement with the ones coming from (1), being the deviation of the order of 1%.

An interesting result can be immediately drawn from a direct analysis of the potential energy expression, Eq. (6). It is simple to see that the extrema of the potential energy depend on the strength of the external magnetic field. Furthermore, if we realise that an increase of that field tends to gather together the two maxima, at the same time that it rises the value of the minimum at $\phi = \pi$ (or at $\phi = 0$ if the field is reversed), we can expect to find the intensity of the field at which those three extrema collapse into a single

maximum. At this particular value of the field there is a single minimum at $\phi = 0$ (or at $\phi = \pi$ if the field is reversed) and tunneling cannot occur. Therefore, using the proposed approach we can estimate the value of the external magnetic field at which tunneling no longer has any meaning if we consider the expression for the potential energy expression, Eq. (6), and look for the value of H_z for which the minimum turns into a maximum. After a direct calculation we obtain

$$H_z^{\text{lim}} = \frac{2K_1}{K_3} \sqrt{j(j+1)}$$

so that

$$H_z^0 = \frac{H_z^{\text{lim}}}{2j} = \frac{K_1}{K_3} \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{j}} \quad (8)$$

is the value of the external parallel magnetic field whose multiples produce a matching of the energy levels in the two potential wells. The result obtained from a numerical diagonalization of Eq. (1) for the matching value in a test case is in good agreement with the predicted value of Eq. (8). It is then evident that for an applied external field of magnitude H_z^{lim} the resulting potential function presents only a single minimum.

It is clear that if we want to discuss all the features of the energy levels associated with Hamiltonian (4) we may numerically solve the Schrödinger equation (7) and get the results. Although this goal is simple and direct, it will not be pursued here.

In what concerns the energy levels splitting associated with the tunneling through the potential barrier present in $V(\phi)$ in the absence of the external magnetic field, i.e., $H_z = 0$, we may take advantage of the even symmetry of $V(\phi)$ as well as of $M(\phi)$ to use the well-known WKB expression ($\hbar = 1$) [12]

$$\Delta\mathcal{E} = \frac{\omega_b}{\pi} \exp \left[-\sqrt{2\mathcal{M}} \int_{\phi_i}^{\phi_s} \sqrt{V(\phi) - \mathcal{E}} d\phi \right], \quad (9)$$

where ω_b is the frequency associated with one of the minima of $V(\phi)$, and $\mathcal{M}$ is a constant suitably taken as an average of $M(\phi)$ in the barrier region. Considering

$$M(\phi_{\min}) \omega_b^2 = \left. \frac{d^2 V(\phi)}{d\phi^2} \right|_{\phi_{\min}}$$

and taking into account that $\phi_{\min} = 0, \pi$ and $\phi_{\max} = \pi/2, 3\pi/2$, we see that

$$\omega_b = 2\sqrt{K_1(K_1 + K_2)j(j+1)}. \quad (10)$$

On the other hand, the exponential factor can be treated in an analytic way. Taking

$$\sqrt{-K_1 j(j+1) \cos^2 \phi + |\mathcal{E}|} = \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}|} \sqrt{1 - \frac{K_1 j(j+1)}{|\mathcal{E}|} \cos^2 \phi}$$

and calling $k^2 = K_1 j(j+1) / |\mathcal{E}|$ we see that the turning points of the integral are given by the equation $\cos \phi_{ext} = \pm k^{-1}$. Therefore,

$$I(\mathcal{E}) = \int_{\phi_i}^{\phi_s} \sqrt{1 - k^2 \cos^2 \phi} = \left[\frac{k^2 - 1}{k} F\left(\arcsin(k \cos), \frac{1}{k}\right) \right]_{\phi_i}^{\phi_s} -$$

$$kE\left(\arcsin(k \cos), \frac{1}{k}\right) \Big|_{\phi_i}^{\phi_s} \quad \text{if } k > 1,$$

where $F(\varphi, p)$ and $E(\varphi, p)$ are the elliptic functions of the first and second kind respectively [13]. Since these functions are odd under the change $\varphi \rightarrow -\varphi$, and using the expression for $\cos \phi_{i,s}$, we obtain

$$I(\mathcal{E}) = 2 \left[-\frac{k^2 - 1}{k} \mathbf{K}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) + k \mathbf{E}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \right], \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{K}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) = F\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{1}{k}\right)$ and $\mathbf{E}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) = E\left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{1}{k}\right)$ are the complete elliptic integrals [13]. Now, using their corresponding series representations we end up with the result

$$I(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{\pi}{2} \left(\frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{8k^3} + \frac{3}{64k^5} + \dots \right) \quad (12)$$

so that, the integral to the lowest order reads

$$I(\mathcal{E}) \simeq \frac{\pi}{2k} = \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{E}|}{K_1 j(j+1)}}. \quad (13)$$

With that result we can then write the barrier penetrability factor

$$P \simeq \exp \left[-\frac{\pi}{2} |\mathcal{E}| \sqrt{\frac{2\mathcal{M}}{K_1 j(j+1)}} \right]. \quad (14)$$

In order to have an estimate of the tunneling factor we have to introduce the approximate constant mass. If we consider for instance the crude simple arithmetic mean in order to get an analytic expression

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{M(\phi = 0) + M(\phi = \frac{\pi}{2})}{2} = \frac{K_1 + 2K_2}{4K_2(K_1 + K_2)}, \quad (15)$$

for the constant mass, we obtain

$$P \simeq \exp \left[-\frac{\pi}{2} |\mathcal{E}| \sqrt{\frac{(K_1 + 2K_2)}{2K_1j(j+1)K_2(K_1 + K_2)}} \right].$$

On the other hand, the frequency expression can be directly obtained from Eq. (10) so that the expression for the energy splitting, up to first order in the exponential, is

$$\Delta\mathcal{E} = \frac{2}{\pi} \sqrt{K_1(K_1 + K_2)j(j+1)} \exp \left[-\frac{\pi}{2} |\mathcal{E}| \sqrt{\frac{(K_1 + 2K_2)}{2K_1j(j+1)K_2(K_1 + K_2)}} \right] \quad (16)$$

As it can be immediately seen, $P(\mathcal{E}) = 1$ at the top of the energy barrier (i.e., $\mathcal{E} = V_{\max} = 0.0$), thus we verify that this expression is not adequate to describe tunneling occurring in energy levels near or at the barrier top. In these cases, we may consider the Kemble-Hill-Wheeler/Miller-Good expression [14, 15, 16, 17] for the barrier penetration factor, namely

$$P(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp \left[\frac{\omega_t}{\pi} (V_0 - \mathcal{E}) \right]},$$

where ω_t is the frequency associated with the concavity at the potential barrier top, and $V_0 = V(\phi = \phi_{top})$. It is important to see that at $\mathcal{E} = V_0$ we get $P(V_0) = 0.5$ instead of the usual WKB value $P = 1.0$, thus assuring that the Kemble-Hill-Wheeler/Miller-Good expression is a better approximation for this particular kind of situation.

If we realise that the exponential factor is the dominant part of the energy splitting expression, Eq. (9), we are lead to consider again expression (14) in order to estimate the temperature below which the quantum effects dominate over the thermal ones. Since the thermal activation is proportional to $\exp(-V_0/k_B T)$, where V_0 is the barrier height, and in our case it is given by

$V_0 = K_1 j(j+1)$, and considering that $|\mathcal{E}| \simeq K_1 j(j+1)$ for $j \gg 1$, then the crossover temperature between the two regimes can be estimated by equating

$$\frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2\mathcal{M}}{K_1 j(j+1)}} = \frac{1}{k_B T_c},$$

that gives

$$T_c = \frac{2}{\pi k_B} \sqrt{\frac{K_1 j(j+1)}{2\mathcal{M}}}.$$

The effective mass plays an important role in the above expression, telling us how the transverse anisotropy governs the behaviour of the relevant physical quantities related to the tunneling. In order to have an estimate of this behaviour let us consider Eq. (15) for the effective mass. It is direct to see that for $K_2 \rightarrow 0$, $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \infty$ so that $T_c \rightarrow 0$, and consequently $\Delta\mathcal{E} \rightarrow 0$, as expected, since then there is no tunneling at all. It is to be stressed that the above quantitative results do not follow due to a particular form of the effective mass used. They would also follow for any reasonable expression for the mass. It is important to observe that the effective mass is the only term carrying the information related to the transverse anisotropy which is responsible for the quantum tunneling effects.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Prof. Renato Jardim from Instituto de Física da Universidade de São Paulo for enlightening discussions. D.G. and B.M.P. were partially supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico, CNPq, Brazil; E.C.S. was supported by CAPES, Brazil. B.M.P. and C.L.L. also acknowledge partial support by Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo, FAPESP, Brazil.

References

- [1] J. L. van Hemmen and A. Sütő, *Europhys. Lett* **1** (1986) 481; J. L. van Hemmen and A. Sütő, *Physica* **141B** (1986) 37.
- [2] M. Enz and R. Schilling, *J. Phys.* **C19** (1986) 1765; M. Enz and R. Schilling, *J. Phys.* **C19** (1986) L711.
- [3] E. M. Chudnovsky and L. Gunther, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60** (1988) 661.

- [4] G. Scharf, W. F. Wreszinski, and J. L. van Hemmen, J. Phys. **A20** (1987) 4309.
- [5] J. Villain, J. de Phys. **35** (1974) 27.
- [6] D. Galetti, Physica **A 374** (2007) 211; doi:10.1016/j.physa.2006.07.030.
- [7] A. Peremolov, *Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1986
- [8] J. J. Griffin and J. A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. **108** (1957) 311.
- [9] D. Galetti and M. Ruzzi, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33** (2000) 2799.
- [10] D. Galetti, B. M. Pimentel, and C. L. Lima, Physica **A351** (2005) 315.
- [11] H. Lipkin, N. Meshkov, and A. J. Glick, Nucl. Phys. **62** (1965) 188.
- [12] L. Landau, *Mécanique Quantique*, MIR, 1989, Chap VII.
- [13] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Rhyzik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, Academic Press, New York, 1980.
- [14] E. C. Kemble, *Fundamental Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, McGrawHill, New York, 1937.
- [15] M. Razavy, *Quantum Theory of Tunneling*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2003.
- [16] D. Hill and J. A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. **89** (1953) 1102.
- [17] S. C. Miller and R. M. Good, Phys. Rev. **91** (1953) 174.